

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 4 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

On page 2 of the Office Action the examiner noted the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(b) and the comments in MPEP § 609.04(a). To ensure that the Examiner considers the EP patent document disclosed and cited in the specification as filed; Applicant submits herewith an Information Disclosure Statement along with a copy of the previously disclosed and cited EP patent document.

**Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 103**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,718 to Saxby in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,516 to Kinchin.

**The Examiner has not Established a *prima facie* Case of Obviousness**

As set forth in the MPEP:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

MPEP 2143

The present claimed invention is a gun-barrel projectile having a metal head and a rear plastic portion. The rear plastic portion includes a pin-shaped anterior part, a rod shaped central part, and a piston-like posterior part. The pin-shaped anterior part is inserted into a hole in the metal head. On firing, the posterior part and anterior part are driven towards each other. A result of this configuration is a reduction of the dispersion of the projectile in the target.

Saxby teaches a conceptually different structure, whereby, upon firing, two elements of the cartridge of Saxby, the anterior portion 1 and the posterior portion 2 (Figs 2A-2C), are driven away from each other. The structure of Saxby causes this to occur, with the result being the providing of two independent energy sources, one to initiate the cycling of a reload mechanism and the other to propel a projectile from a casing. The claimed structure of the present invention, as described above, causes the opposite to occur, that is the posterior and anterior parts are driven towards each other, with a different result (reduced dispersion).

The teachings and suggestion of Kinchin fail to teach or suggest these claimed elements. The examiner relies on Kinchin for an alleged teaching of the proposition that a portion of a cartridge for a gun can be made of plastic, and nothing in Kinchin teaches or suggests a gun-barrel projectile having a metal head and a rear plastic portion, with the rear plastic portion including a pin-shaped anterior part, a rod shaped central part, and a piston-like posterior part, with the pin-shaped anterior part being inserted into a hole in the metal head, whereby, on firing, the posterior part and anterior part are driven towards each other.

Since the claimed invention includes specific recitation of claim elements that are neither taught nor suggested by Saxby and Kinchin, either alone or in combination, it is submitted that

the claimed invention patentably defines over the prior art and that the present application is in condition fort allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

**Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

December 18, 2006  
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/  
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire  
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP  
2600 ARAMARK Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189